

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 50.—No. 10.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1824. [Price 1s.

TO

MR. ALDERMAN WOOD,

On the Bill for authorising the Retail of Beer (in certain cases) without a Licence from a Justice, or Justices, or any other Magistrate, or Magistrates.

Kensington, 2d June, 1824.

SIR,

I HAVE been greatly surprised at your opposition to what is generally called the BEER-BILL, and I cannot refrain from remonstrating with you on the subject. Long have I been endeavouring to help to pull down the *monopoly* in the trade in Beer, so injurious to the people of England, so unjust towards them, so cruel in a thousand ways. I must confess, that I thought this monopoly so firmly rooted in the soil of taxation, that it never could be shaken. Contrary to my fears, the Ministers themselves have set about this almost holy work; and, judge you,

then, of my mortification, when I see you at the head of, or, at least, very forward in, an opposition against this Bill!

I propose to address to you some remarks upon the debate of Monday, the 24th of May, on Mr. MABERLY'S motion for setting aside this Bill. The proposition (made by Mr. Robinson) was, for the House to go into a *Committee on the Bill*. This was opposed by Mr. MABERLY, who concluded with a motion for going into the Committee *that day six months*; which motion is well known to be the same as a motion for rejecting the Bill altogether. This motion was rejected by the House, which went into the Committee.

This is a subject, perhaps, of greater interest than any one which has come, or which will come, before Parliament this year, if we except only the subjects connected with the peace of Ireland. The people at large are so deeply interested in this Beer trade, that they ought, if possible, to know the sentiments of every

T



member relating to it. We shall, many a day hence, have to look back to what was said in Parliament upon this Bill. The debate must be matter of great interest now. I wish, too, to keep clear of all imputation as to misrepresenting or garbling. I will, therefore, insert the whole of the report of the debate, as I find that report in the Morning Chronicle of the 25th of May. When I have done that, I shall add my remarks.

—
The Order of the Day for the Consideration of the Beer Duties' Bill having been read, it was ordered that the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the whole House.

The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* moved that the House do now resolve itself into the said Committee.

Mr. *Maberly* said, the House should give the subject the greatest attention before they consented to pass this Bill. A Bill had been brought in last year which the *Chancellor of the Exchequer* had stated to be an experiment, and that experiment had entirely failed—a circumstance which should induce them to enter with caution on a subject in which such large interests were concerned. The present Bill originally professed to have two objects—the first to take the unequal duty off beer and lay it on malt; the next to open the beer-trade to competition. As to the first of these objects, the Bill originally

had not performed the professions, for it had kept in effect a duty of twenty shillings a quarter on the persons who brewed their own beer, and retained a duty of 55s. on those who drank the beer of the public brewer. It had also, according to the documents submitted to him, imposed an additional duty of 4s. a barrel on table beer—an addition, in fact, of one hundred per cent. This part of the Bill had, however, been abandoned, and the part which remained was that which went to *open the Beer Trade to the competition of the Retail Brewers*. It had been stated, that the Bill was to be accompanied by measures which would give relief to the licensed victuallers; but so far from this being the case, the *victuallers contended, that the London victuallers* would be ruined, and that others would sustain material injury from this Bill. The grounds on which he should oppose the Bill at present were very simple; he contended, that a full inquiry should take place; he contended for the principle of free trade; but free trade was only to be attained by placing *the whole duty on malt*, and by taking off the duty on beer, relieving the brewer from all the trammels of the Excise, to which he was now subject. Though the present Bill *might in some degree lower the price of beer*, he thought it would do so by means much more liable to objection than those he proposed. The licensed publicans were, from their situation, *entitled to much*

consideration; they were commonly gentlemen's servants and others who had got a little money, and invested the whole of it in the purchase of leases of their houses. This capital they were liable to lose, on account of the slightest deviation from the line prescribed by the laws; they held it dependent upon their good behaviour, and were subject also to many other inconveniences too well known to require to be enumerated. There were 50,000 persons interested in the present system as brewers and publicans. All they asked was, that such a change as was contemplated should not be made without a full investigation. This was surely most reasonable, and he should on this ground move that the Bill be recommitted this day six months, in order to have the whole subject inquired into. He wished the trade to be as open and free as possible, but it was contrary to the principles of freedom to impose one description of duties on the rich who brewed their own beer, and a higher duty on the poor who were obliged to buy their beer. It was in vain to say that it was open to the poor to brew their own beer. They had not the capital to advance for utensils; they could not allow it to improve by lying in large bodies, and the practical effect then was to burden him with an unfair duty of 35s. a quarter above the rich man. One part of the Bill had been got rid of, and he had no doubt that if the licensed victuallers had had advocates

in the House as powerful as the brewers, it would have shared the same fate. He moved as an Amendment, that the House resolve itself into the Committee this day six months.

Mr. Davenport seconded the Amendment. He opposed the Bill, because it was unjust. The licensed victuallers now lay under heavier rates and taxes, paid heavier rents than other tradesmen, and were subject also to the burden of quartering soldiers. They were also, as the present law stood, answerable to the Magistrates for the good order of their houses. It was unjust, therefore, to open them to the competition of the brewers, who were under no such restriction.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said, that the first part of the argument of the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Maberly), referred to a question which had already been before the House, and decided on: and as it was now agreed that every thing that related to the change of duties, should be taken out of the Bill, he should say nothing on that subject, because it had no necessary connexion with the matter really under consideration. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) was at a loss to know what should be discussed in the Committee; because, as the Honourable Gentleman had admitted, that the price of beer would be lowered by the Bill, that sufficiently established the advantages that would result from it. The mere fact, that the price would

be lowered, proved that the beer was now maintained *at a higher price than was necessary*. A Committee was needed, it might be said, to show the loss to what had been called vested interests. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) conceived it possible that some loss, or rather some diminution of profit, might be occasioned by the Bill; but if that was admitted, was it to be a conclusive bar to an alteration of the law? The state of the law demanded some change, for it was extremely doubtful whether the brewers might not even now retail beer in the manner authorized by this Bill. It would be recollected, that in the last session the Honourable Member for Reading (Mr. F. Palmer,) had asked him whether there was any obstacle to brewers selling by retail, and he had answered that there was not, as far as the Excise was concerned. The same answer was given in a more formal manner, on an application to the Board of Excise. In consequence of that a number of brewers had set up trade in that way, prosecutions were commenced against them, both at Reading and Brentford, *and convictions were obtained*. Without being a lawyer, he confessed that he did not see how those convictions were sustainable on ground of reason. The convictions were brought by the parties concerned into the Court of King's Bench, and was argued the first term of this year, and was put off to the present term (he believed) for further argument. Now the state of the law was at least so doubtful that the Court of King's Bench threw out a suggestion, that the law had better be settled by an enactment on the subject. On looking at the subject, he could not persuade himself that the public ought to be deprived of the advantage, because those who had, under the regulations of the law, enjoyed a practical monopoly, might have their profits in some degree lowered by competition [hear, hear!]. This argument, if it were allowed to prevail, would be good against opening any monopoly whatever [hear, hear!]. The parties could not say, in this case, that they had been taken by surprise. A Committee two years ago had decided against the monopoly, though they had recommended caution and time in abolishing it. An Honourable Member too (Mr. Brougham) had brought the subject under consideration in a Bill in which he went further than the present measure, for he had proposed to allow all persons to sell beer whether they had brewed it or no. Though he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had objected to that Bill on grounds which it was not now necessary to restate (chiefly on account of the Revenue), he had distinctly said, that he was not adverse to the principle of the measure, as far as it went to destroy the monopoly; but that he thought other means might be adopted to put the principle in force. He was satisfied

that nothing could depend on the investigation before a Committee, for the question was, Whether the injury to the persons who petitioned the House should form a permanent obstacle to the opening of the trade? He objected to the Committee, therefore, and called on the House to pronounce Aye or No, whether a free trade should be established in this essential article of life, and he hoped, nay, he confidently believed, that the House would declare, by its vote, that the interests of the poorer class of consumers should not be set aside, because those interests happened to interfere with the profits of a long-established monopoly [cheers].

Mr. Lockhart said, the Right Honourable Gentleman had truly stated the opinion of the Committee on the Beer trade, of which he (Mr. L.) happened to be Chairman. The Committee could not consider that the licensed victuallers could be considered to have *a vested interest*, when they might be deprived of their licences by the Board of Excise for certain causes, and held other licences terminable at the pleasure of the Magistrates. If, indeed, the brewers and victuallers had enjoyed a monopoly by patent, it could be set aside by *fieri facias*, because they had misused it by forcing on the public in all cases a weak, and in some cases, a *deleterious beverage*. The Committee, though they had not recommended the throwing open of the trade by legislative enactment, had

recommended to Magistrates to open free houses wherever the monopoly existed. The Honourable Member contended that the poor, in their capacity of labourers, derived benefit from the encouragement now given to private brewing, and he was convinced that the present Bill, far from encouraging *vice and immorality*, would much benefit the morals as well as the comfort of the poor, by allowing them to drink good beer in their own houses, without being obliged, as they now were, to *mix with company they might wish to avoid*.

Mr. Wilson said, if the Bill only destroyed the monopoly of the brewers, he should concur with the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Lockhart); but he thought the case of the licensed victuallers was entitled to every consideration. If the Licensed Victuallers were relieved from the heavy duties and other burdens that pressed on them, the case might be different; but the advantages they enjoyed should not be taken away while their disadvantages remained. He anticipated, too, considerable inconvenience from the *assemblage at the doors of the brewers* of the persons who would resort thither for their beer, and who (whether vice and immorality were produced or not) would form a great *inconvenience to passengers*.

Mr. F. Palmer said, he anticipated from this measure more good to the mechanics, tradesmen, and to the mass of the people, than from any

other measure that could be introduced into the House. A strong proof of the advantages of retail brewing was to be found in the fact, that barley had risen in price, and maintained its advance ever since the practice began. The great brewers of this country were a *most enlightened and powerful body of men*, and from their talents, as well as wealth, were *entitled to every consideration*—he respected them much, but if they were ten times more powerful than they are, he had a duty to the public to perform. It was a fact that seemed to be lost sight of in this discussion, that the licensed victuallers and wholesale brewers, who petitioned against the Bill, would still hold an advantage of 8½ per cent. over the retail brewers, whose competition they dreaded. The wholesale brewers had, in fact, every 12th cask duty free. Now, he should mention the sums received by some of the great public brewers of the metropolis in the course of a year. One of them 3,867*l.* 15*s.* returned to him on this account, and another 12,930*l.* and odd. This, surely, was no trifling advantage—the public-houses were *in the hands of the great brewers*, or if not their property, were supplied by them. He had been told by some of his friends, that it was no matter whether there were public or private brewers, as there were enough of them to produce competition. In answer to this he would state a fact—the public brewers met in a town

of Oakingham periodically, from all the range of country from High Wycombe, through Maidenhead and Windsor to Guilford, a range of 40 miles, to regulate how much wort they should run, and at what price they should sell their beer. He knew this from one of the parties who attended those meetings. What, in such a state of things, became of competition? [hear!]. It was denied, that in general the brewers had monopolized the public-houses. All he could say was, that in the part of the country with which he was most intimately acquainted, it was very rare to find a free house. He allowed that much of the evil of the present state of things had arisen from the monstrous neglect of the Magistracy. Where they had done their duty, there had been no complaints. The retail breweries, which this Bill sanctioned, were calculated to break down the abuses of the present system. In the town of Brighton there used to be constant complaints, but he understood that since the establishment of the retail breweries, that there was no better beer in any part of the kingdom. The same he knew to be the case in different places. Whether the public brewers had monopolized the public-houses or not, it was clearly their interest to do so. A house worth 100*l.*, if it had a sign-post affixed to it with a licence, became worth 30*l.* a-year. At the ordinary rate, fourteen years' purchase, the value to an indifferent person would be 420*l.*

But suppose such a house, as it frequently did, drew sixty barrels a month, the drawback from the Excise amounted to 30*l.* a-year, so that on this account it was worth to the brewer 420*l.* more than to any other person. He gave his warm support to the Bill.

Mr. *Whitbread* said, that, being connected with one of the great London breweries, he should, as a matter of taste, have abstained from voting altogether; but when he considered that a great number of *his constituents were licensed victuallers*, who were *most unjustly treated by the Bill*, he should, for *their sake*, and *not for his own*, vote against the Bill.

Mr. Alderman *Bridges* opposed the Bill, and apprehended considerable inconvenience from the retail breweries. Persons would assemble to drink their beer in the neighbourhood of these retail shops, where they might *commit disorders*, which were less likely to take place in the houses of publicans, as they were under the control of the Magistrates. He thought the Bill was fraught with evils of great magnitude, and he should therefore support the Amendment.

Sir J. *Sebright* believed that Honourable Gentlemen were not generally aware of the injurious effects of the monopoly in the sale of beer. In many towns and villages with which he was acquainted, the monopoly was completely possessed by a particular brewer, who had no in-

ducement from competition to brew beer of a better quality. It was a monopoly under which the people of this country had long suffered, and he begged leave, as one of the Country Gentlemen in that House, to return the Right Honourable Gentleman opposite his sincere thanks for having brought forward this measure.

Mr. *Calvert* said, that it was not his intention originally to have said any thing on a subject in which he was himself personally interested. Representing, however, as he did, a *very large body of persons* who were deeply interested in this question, although it was generally his practice not to oppose a Bill going into the Committee, he should feel it his duty on the present occasion to support the Amendment of the Honourable Member for Abingdon (Mr. *Maberly*). He understood that it was the intention of the Right Honourable Gentleman opposite to make a great many alterations in the Bill. He intended to alter the title, to alter the preamble, and to strike out a great part of the Bill. Under these circumstances, he thought the best course the Right Honourable Gentleman could take, would be to print the Bill in its altered state, and *defer the further consideration of it till the next Session*. Perfectly satisfied, as he (Mr. C.) was, that the measure would totally ruin a large class of *industrious individuals*, he would give his *cordial support* to the Amendment.

Colonel *Davies* said, that a large capital had been embarked on the faith of the existing Acts of Parliament, and that, as a numerous and industrious class of persons would be ruined by the proposed measure, he should give his vote, although reluctantly, for the Amendment.

Sir *E. Knatchbull* said, that though sufficient attention might have been paid to the interests of the brewers, the interests of the publicans had not been sufficiently considered. In this and the last Session of Parliament numerous Petitions had been presented against Excise Licences, and if he (Sir E. K.) understood the operation of this Bill, the interests of the licensed victuallers would be very seriously affected by it. The Bill might, or might not operate beneficially to the public, but that it would operate injuriously to the interests of that particular class of individuals was indisputable. The Right Honourable Gentleman had engaged to take this subject into his consideration, with a view of extending to this class of persons the relief to which they might be entitled. Now, he thought he could satisfy the House that the Bill, with respect to duties, would afford no relief whatever to the licensed victuallers. As the law stood at present, the duties which had been imposed on the publicans during the war, would expire in two years. Now the duties imposed by the present Bill were to be permanently continued, and would place the pub-

licans in a worse situation than that in which they would have stood, had the war duties been suffered to expire. Their interests would not only suffer therefore from increased competition, but they were actually placed in a much worse situation by the new duties. He was not prepared to say whether a monopoly did or did not exist, to the extent which had been stated, but he should certainly feel it right, under all the circumstances, to vote for the Amendment.

Mr. *Curwen* said, that though he should have been anxious to support the private interest of the publicans in the county which he had the honour to represent, if he could have done so consistently with the permanent interests of the public; yet, when he considered the great advantages which the public at large would derive from this measure, it was impossible for him not to support the Bill. The consequence of the existing monopoly had been such a deterioration of the malt liquor, as to render it almost unfit to drink. He considered this a measure of great public importance, and he should give it his warm support.

Mr. *Monck* said it could not be fairly contended that this measure introduced an alteration of the law, which had not been duly considered, and the necessity of which had not been fully proved, after the valuable Report of the Committee which sat on this subject. That Report proved that the greatest abuses existed in the

beer trade. Mr. Barclay, who gave evidence before that Committee, declared, that for his own part, considering the subject in an extended point of view, he was perfectly willing to assist in opening the trade. He served a great number of free houses, many of them to a large extent, probably with as many as 1000 barrels a-year. Many of these houses were offered to him for purchase, which he declined, because he thought he had embarked sufficient capital in the trade, and they had been bought up by other brewers. The system of buying up free houses had been carried by brewers to an extent which operated most injuriously to the interests of the public, Mr. Barclay, in his endeavours to open the trade, had acted like an honest man; he had no other wish than to serve the public with a good article at a fair and reasonable price. The brewers themselves were interested in the success of the present measure, for their own characters would rise in proportion as the quality of their beer was improved. No just and honourable tradesman need fear competition; let the brewer go into the market like any other tradesman, and let his success depend on his serving the public with a good article at a fair price. There was this difference between the English and Scotch Petitions which had been presented against this Bill, that while the English Petitions uniformly prayed that the Bill might not pass into a law, because

it would operate injuriously to the retail brewers, all the Scotch Petitions complained of was the scale of duties, which, they contended, would be excessively oppressive to them, because the duty being laid on the barley, without reference to its quality, would operate unequally on the barley cultivated in Scotland, which was of an inferior quality. There was not one word, however, in the Scotch Petitions about injury to the interests of the retail brewers, because in Scotland the trade in beer, like every other trade, was fair and open, and the Scotch Magistrates, unlike the Magistrates in this country, granted licences, as a matter of course, to every one who wished to embark in the trade, on security being given for the good conduct of the house. The publicans had already a right to brew their own beer, if they thought proper. Out of two thousand free houses, there were not more than fifty-six in which the publicans brewed their own beer, because, in consequence of the competition among the brewers, and the great facilities which they possessed in the conduct of their trade, the private brewer found it impossible to brew it at as cheap a rate. He could not at all comprehend the arguments by which the Honourable Gentleman opposite had endeavoured to show that this Bill would operate injuriously to the morals of the people. It was said that the people would assemble to drink their beer in the corners of

streets; but could they not do so if they thought proper at present? As to the disorders which the Honourable Gentleman seemed to apprehend, he (Mr. M.) thought the people would, of course, be liable under the proposed Bill, as they were already, to the control of the Police. There was a great number of eating-houses and oyster-shops in the metropolis, to which beer was brought from public-houses in the neighbourhood, and he believed these eating-houses and oyster-shops were very beneficially and innocently conducted. Now that these houses, if they should be served by retail beer-shops, instead of public houses, should suddenly change their nature, and become nuisances, really appeared to him (Mr. Monck) to be a very groundless apprehension. If any abuses should arise under the operation of this Bill, it would be competent to the Legislature to interpose, and he doubted not that Parliament would be able to find a remedy for them. He supported this Bill not with a view to the interests of any particular class, but because he was satisfied that it would benefit the community at large, by enabling them to get a good article at a moderate price. This was not a matter of experiment, but of experience, as the public had already derived great advantage from retail breweries, wherever they had been established. The Right Honourable Gentleman opposite had done himself great honour by bringing forward the present

measure, which had been called for year after year by the public. In doing this he must lay his account for a certain portion of reproach and opposition from interested persons, but he would receive on the other hand what to his honourable mind would be the best compensation—he would be hailed throughout the country as the poor man's friend, he would receive throughout the country the poor man's blessing [hear, hear!].

Mr. Calvert explained.

Mr. Wodehouse thought that a great deal of prejudice and misrepresentation had gone forth with respect to the trade in beer. He should not vote, however, for the Amendment of the Honourable Member for Abingdon. When this subject was under consideration last year, he (Mr. W.) had stated, that a measure imposing a low rate of duty on beer would be desirable, and that, to promote that object, he should have no objection to an increase of the present duty on malt. At the same time, he thought it would be a measure of great impolicy, as well as of gross injustice, when the maltsters were already liable to a duty of 3,000,000*l.* to raise that duty in effect to 7,000,000 . by adopting the proposition of the Honourable Member for Abingdon (Mr. Maberly), which would subject them to the rigorous exactions of every penalty attached to the trade in malt.

Mr. Alderman Wood denied that the public had called for the present

measure. Two Petitions only from Reading and Newbury, in favour of the Bill, had been laid on the table of the House. Amidst so many millions, therefore, of which the population of this country consisted, no more than 2,000 persons had come forward in its support. He admitted that this Bill would enable the public to get the article cheap, but as to its being good, that was quite out of the question [a laugh]. The doctrine which had been preached up about free trade was all very fine. All he wished was, that the Right Honourable Gentleman opposite would do justice. The Right Honourable Gentleman had abandoned his first Bill for reducing the duty on malt from 37s. 6d. to 24s., which would have afforded some relief to the poor man, and he has now brought forward a measure from which no advantage whatever would be derived. A great deal had been said about the immense monopoly which existed in the beer trade. Now it appeared from the returns on the table of the House, that there were 44,000 public-houses in the kingdom, of which 22,000 brewed their own beer. Here was an end at once therefore to one-half of the supposed monopoly. This measure proceeded on a principle which was directly opposed to that on which Mr. Colquhoun acted. That able Magistrate endeavoured to limit the number of licences in the same neighbourhood, so that the public-houses might come under the immediate ob-

servation of the Magistrates. Great evils would arise from the establishment of houses for the sale of beer, over which the Magistrates would have no control, and those evils had already been experienced in Bath and Lancashire. The measure was not called for by any want of free houses. It appeared from the returns, that in the town of Leeds alone there were 300 public-houses, of which only twenty were not free. If the Right Honourable Gentleman opposite wished to give the public cheap beer, let him take off the duty of 37s. 6d. on malt; that was a measure which would give universal satisfaction. If he wished to give effect to the principles of free trade, let him take off the shackles which fettered the trade of the brewers. Let him not, while he took off the burdens from one trade, impose additional shackles on the class of tradesmen, who are now to be ruined. If the Right Honourable Gentleman acted consistently with his own principles, why did he not allow a free importation of corn? This would be a real benefit to the poor man. If fair and honest returns had been made, the ports would have been open long ago, and corn would have been at the price to which the poor of this country were entitled. Convinced, as he was, that the Right Honourable Gentleman had abandoned the only part of his measure which was calculated to benefit the public, and that the Bill in its present shape would

entail ruin on a large class of honest and respectable tradesmen, he should give his vote for the Amendment.

Mr. Monck referred to a passage in the Report of the Committee, in proof of the abuses in the beer trade.

Mr. Calvert denied, that any evidence had been brought before the Committee to justify the assertion, that the brewers of London sold two sorts of beer—one to their own houses, and another to the free houses.

Mr. Denison expressed his intention to support the Amendment of the Honourable Member for Abingdon (Mr. Maberly); he thought the House and the country indebted to the Right Honourable Gentleman, for having introduced a measure, the object of which was to supply the public with a better commodity at a cheaper rate.

At the same time it ought not to be forgotten that the measure was calculated to injure a great body of industrious individuals. A large capital had been embarked in the beer trade on the faith of existing Acts of Parliament. A great deal had been said in that House on other occasions of vested interests and vested rights, and he would ask the Right Honourable Gentleman, whether the rights and interests of this class of tradesmen ought not to be considered? The Honourable Member for Abingdon (Mr. Maberly) did not object to the measure *in toto*; he had merely recommended a Committee which might inquire into the whole subject, and endeavour in the next Session to

reconcile the interests of the publicans with those of the public. He should for these reasons vote for the Amendment, though he felt at the same time that the measure of the Right Honourable Gentleman might ultimately prove beneficial to the public.

Mr. Wildes thought that no London brewer would condescend to sell different sorts of beer to different classes of his customers. Brewers with large capitals were able to brew a much better beer, at a lower rate than could possibly be brewed by private brewers. He was satisfied that this measure would not only be ruinous to a numerous class of tradesmen, but that it would be of no advantage to the public.

Mr. Curteis expressed his determination to vote for the Amendment.

Mr. Mansfield said, that many Petitions from persons deeply interested in the measure had been entrusted to his hands, and it was certainly his intention originally to have voted against the Bill. The Bill, however, had been so altered and modified, as to remove the objections which he had to it; and he felt himself at liberty to vote for a Bill which, as it now stood, would enable the middle and labouring classes to drink a better commodity at a greatly reduced price.

Mr. Butterworth observed, that great inconvenience and injury to public morals would arise from allowing persons to assemble for the purpose of drinking beer without the

the control of Magistrates. The Honourable Member continued to address the House for some time, but we lament that the *noise and coughing* which prevailed in the House during the rest of his speech, prevents us from giving more than his first observation.

The House then divided, when there appeared—For going into Committee, 99 — Against it, 32—Majority 67.”

Thus ended the debate, the prospect certainly being, that the Bill will become a law. But, until it be a law, my anxiety for its success will not cease. I will, therefore, now remark upon the objections offered to it, and particularly those offered to it by you.

Your first objection is, that *the public have not called for the Bill*; that there have been only *two petitions* for it; that, out of *so many millions* of people, only about two thousand had *asked for this Bill*. Is this a fair representation, Sir? Because there have been only two petitions for this Bill, is it fair to argue that the people do not want the Bill? And, above all things, is it fair to infer, that the Bill will be mischievous to the people? How many acts, absolutely necessary to the country, are passed without a single petition for or against; and how many acts of

a contrary description are also passed without a single petition? Would you have the Parliament pass no act, unless it be first “*called for*” by the people; and if any act, why not this act?

But, in this case, there have been innumerable petitions against the Bill. Very true. But look at the difference of the parties: those who want the Bill are the labouring people at large. Who is to draw up petitions for these people? They, in fact, have no knowledge of the matter, and only gather from rumour that something is to be done about selling beer. Far otherwise is it with monopolizing brewers and the keepers of public-houses. Mr. Fyche Palmer said, that the public brewers of this country “were a most *enlightened* and powerful body of men.” As to their illumination, generally speaking, I cannot speak; but I can easily imagine, that they have watched this Bill as a cat watches a mouse; that they have had every possible iron in the fire to oppose it; and that their slaves, the publicans, have been working like Turks in this their particular service. This is a body of men, managed with as much regularity as an army is managed. They can bring a volume of petitions into the House on any day that they

please. What are those disconnected millions, called *the public*, to do, in the way of petitioning, against a body like this? It is the duty of the Government to protect the public against all such combinations; and, in the present case, it has done its duty.

If laws were to be passed or rejected, merely on the ground of the petitions for or against them, the busy and active monopolizers would soon make the rest of the community their slaves. This has been one of the great arguments; I mean this argument of yours, has always been one of the great arguments of corruption, when she has been accused of doing things hostile to the people, or of omitting to do things for the good of the people. When the Bills for putting our lives at the mercy of Sidmouth and Castlereagh were passed in 1817, we were told, that the nation *liked* those Bills; for that there were only two or three petitions against them! And, as to the sunset and sunrise law, the transportation without trial by jury law, in Ireland, it was actually argued that the Irish people were delighted with it, and that the proof was, that there was not a single petition against it!

Such arguments were naturally to be expected from boroughmon-

gers and their tools; and, therefore, not to be expected from *you*. The fact is, that the people at large do not, even now, know the tendency of the Bill; and it will take a considerable time to make them understand any thing about it, while the publicans, and their lords and masters the big brewers have, from the beginning, clearly understood the whole matter, and have been busily at work in all sorts of ways, to defeat the really honest and benevolent intentions of the Government, in which work they have, I am sorry to say, had your co-operation.

You tell us, Sir, that this Bill will do injustice; that it will entail ruin on a large class of respectable tradesmen; and that it will do no good whatever to the labouring classes. These are your assertions relative to this Bill; let us now see, then, what this Bill is, and what it will do.

At present, the beer which is sold at the public-houses is, almost universally, very bad in quality, and much dearer than it need to be. Nobody will deny this. The account which I have given, in my *Cottage Economy*, of the adulteration of beer, and the exorbitant price in proportion to the quantity of malt and hops used, is perfectly correct. That which

costs sixpence at the public-house, ought, at the very most, not to cost more than fourpence. In short, it is notorious; it is a fact that must be, that, supposing all to be honest and fair, the publican must sell his beer at a price to enable him to meet the enormous rent which he has to pay; the licence for which he has to pay; and for the expenses necessary to support himself and family doing work other than that of keeping the house; all which expenses, mind, the labouring man's pot of beer will, in a short time, be freed of by this Bill.

The public-houses are, in general, the property of BIG BREWERS, who compel the people that keep the houses to sell the beer of those big brewers and no other beer! What a monstrous system! What an oppressive monopoly! and yet, strange to say, you speak in defence of it. You tell us, that there are *forty-four thousand* public-houses in the kingdom; and that, *twenty-two thousand of these brew their own beer*. Thus, say you, "*one-half*" of the *supposed monopoly* ends "*at once*." Now, Sir, I wish I could believe, that you did not perceive the fallacy of this statement. I will suppose that one-half of the houses brew their own

beer. But what *sort of houses* are those? Why, little houses in the country, fifty of which do not draw so much beer as one single house belonging to HANBURY, BUXTON & Co., or any other of the pious saints, who serve out that very dark-looking stuff, called porter, to the sinners of this and other great towns. If you come to numbers of *houses*, all is deception. It ought to have been a return of the number of barrels of beer. There are hundreds and even thousands of little country public-houses, which do not, upon an average, draw much more than a gallon of beer a-day. These houses are kept by little farmers, wheelwrights, blacksmiths; and these houses remain *free*, only because it is not worth the big brewers' while to enslave them.

The rent of a house is, in many cases, twenty times as much as it would be, if it were not licensed as a public-house. Upon an average the rent is augmented six fold, perhaps, by the licence, if the house be in any city or considerable town. Consequently the *consumer* of the beer has to pay all that part of the rent which the licence occasions. Then, as I said before, the beer which is drank at the public-house is charged with a portion of the ex-

penise of an idle life for the publican and his family, except in the cases just now mentioned, where the publican is a little farmer or the like. In those cases, the smallness of the quantity sold makes the seller put on a higher profit. To get a licence requires some interest. Something goes for it in one way or another; and the poor fellows who consume the beer, have to pay for this something, in the end.

Now then, let us see what Mr. Robinson's Bill will do for us. It will do this: enable a brewer to sell by retail. He is to pay a little more duty upon his beer for permission to sell retail. But the Bill does not require him to have a Justice of the Peace licence to his house; he is in no danger of having his trade taken away by Magistrates; in short, is like another big brewer, only he can *sell by retail*: he can sell any man a pot of beer as well as a publican can; and, having no publican's licence to pay for, not being subject to have his trade put an end to by the caprice of Justices of the Peace, not having to pay any of that high rent, which is occasioned by his house being licensed; being able to serve fifty times as many persons as a publican can, and it not being neces-

sary for him and his family to waste their time in waiting upon and humouring a parcel of sots; free from all the charges, losses, and annoyances, he can sell as good beer for *fourpence* a pot as the licensed and lazy publican can sell for *sixpence* a pot.

But there is this difference between him and the licensed publican. The latter may sell his beer to those (which he chiefly does indeed) who *drink it in his house*. Those who sit and sot and soak and sleep, and who deserve to be kicked into the street.—Wretches who steal away from their families, to guzzle down in a public-house, that which they ought to enjoy, if at all, with those families. The licensed publican's trade is carried on in this way: but, the *retail brewer is not to sell beer to be drank upon his premises*. The labouring man can get from him for fourpence, or less, that which he must give the licensed publican sixpence for. But he must take it away; he must not drink it in the brewer's house or premises; he must take it home; and, pray, Sir, is not this a wise measure? Is it not a measure that must necessarily be favourable to good morals and happiness amongst the people?

The Yankees have a favourite

expression, when disputing about any project or scheme. "Come," say they, "*let us try it*;" and, let us *try* this Bill of Mr. Robinson. Let us suppose a town with twenty public-houses in it. The unnecessary expense for these twenty public-houses would be, in the first place, about five hundred a-year in the shape of rent. Then there would be the twenty licences to pay for, the amount of which I do not exactly know. There would be the direct taxes on twenty houses. There would be the expense of maintaining twenty publicans' families pretty nearly in idleness. Shut up the twenty public-houses, and let the people buy beer of a retail brewer, who comes and sets himself up instead of the public-houses, and you have the rent of one house to pay for; you have one licence to pay for; you have one family to keep in place of twenty; and all these savings go, of course, to the consumer of the beer. Thus are the people of this town benefited; thus do they get for fourpence that for which they paid sixpence before. And yet, Sir, the report says that you declared, that the people would derive from this measure no advantage at all!

There was a great talk during the debate of the great merit of

these men, called publicans. Mr. Maberly said that they were "entitled to much consideration; they were commonly gentlemen's servants, and others who had got a little money and invested the whole of it in the purchase of leases of their houses." I am not aware, Mr. Alderman, of any peculiar merit here set forth. Colonel Davies called them an *industrious* class of persons, and so did Mr. Calvert. Now, Sir, though you say that they are a class of honest and respectable tradesmen, and, though I am far from saying, that there are not some, and even many, publicans answering to that description, I nevertheless venture to say, that they are as far from that description as any class of persons in the kingdom. I do not speak of the country publicans in general, who unite that business to their little farming or other pursuits; but, excepting these, and excepting the keepers of inns and taverns, who must necessarily possess considerable property, and who are but very little concerned in the sale of brewers' drugs: with these exceptions, I think the publicans of this country the worst men in it. Four out of five of them are tradesmen too heedless, too lazy to follow their trades. The

are look of a great part of them
 g. They are examples in every thing that is bad ; drinking, gaming, sitting up at nights, living in the society of prostitutes, and above all things an example in laziness and filth. Their tawdry and tippling wives breed children for scarcely any other purposes than that of tenanting the Bridewell, the jail, and the hulks. Verily a most "*respectable and honest* class of tradespeople !"

However, this is all a pretence about the publicans. They have *no property* in the houses. Nine times out of ten, except as to the little insignificant houses in the country, the houses are the property of the big brewers, and these publicans are their slaves. Very fit to be slaves, I allow ; but slaves they are, and of the basest description. At the time when old Sidmouth was in the height of his glory, that is to say, from 1817 to 1819 inclusive, the publicans in the North were the principal spies. Some of the miscreants, when accused of their infamy, pleaded *necessity* ; pleaded that the bread of themselves and their families depended upon it ; and yet this, Sir, is the class of men, of whose *vested interests*, of whose industry and respectability we have heard so much talk ! Would to God that

they could all be broken up ! But all in good time. A good beginning is now making in closing up these dens of fraud, drunkenness, debauchery, and perfidy.

However, to pretend that these publicans will suffer by the loss of their "*vested interests*," is certainly a specimen of boldness in putting forth pretences that has seldom been surpassed. Mr. WHITBREAD would, "as a matter of *taste*, have abstained from voting altogether ; but when he considered that a great number of his constituents were licensed victuallers, who were most unjustly treated by the Bill, he would, for *their sake*, and *not for his own*, vote against the Bill." That is to say, this "nice young man," as the patriots call him, one of our county members, will, for the sake of the publicans of *Middlesex*, vote against all the rest of the people of Middlesex getting their beer at fourpence a pot instead of sixpence !

Just the same sentiment ; precisely the same, operated with Mr. CALVERT, of the Borough. This gentleman, also, did not intend to say a word on the subject. Bless us ! But, for the sake of a large body of persons that *he represented* ; for the sake of a large class of "*industrious individuals*,"

he would give his "*cordial*" vote against the Bill. I dare say, Sir, the vote was cordial enough; but, what do you think the nation will say of these two big brewers, who voted against a measure which all allowed would make beer cheaper; and which *all but you allowed* would give a better article for less money; what will the nation think of these two big brewers, who asserted that they voted against this measure, *not for their own sakes*, but for the sake of the publicans, no thousand of which publicans can lose so much by the measure as either of these two men! We shall see whether the knaves and fools of Middlesex and of the Borough of Southwark will remember these things two years and a half from this day.

For a thousand reasons we ought to wish this race of publicans to be ousted, this vile trade to be put an end to; but amongst these reasons is the corrupt influence of which publicans are the agents at elections. Mr. WYNDHAM mentioned, many years ago, in a debate in the House of Commons, the base and corrupt influence of the big brewers at elections. He represented the publicans as the agents of the former in carrying on the work of corruption. He added, that universal suffrage would

be no protection against these; but the contrary; for, he said, the publican commands all the band of blackguards that water at his house; universal suffrage would bring the skum of the earth to the top; the publicans take all the skum with them; the big brewers command the publicans; and, therefore, before you make your reform, down with these monopolizing brewers at any rate. He added, that, if we would do that, he would see whether he would join us; but, while there was the smallest danger of our leading him under the sway of a brewer aristocracy, he was resolved not to stir a step along with us.

The Ministers can see, doubtless, what a formidable body the brewers and their understrappers are. COLONEL DAVIES, who talked of their capital embarked under the faith of existing acts of parliament, and who complimented the publicans; Mr. CURTIES, who expressed his determination to vote against the Bill, and even you yourself, Sir, all seemed to have been sensible of the formidable character of this licensed, lazy and gossiping crew.

But, what Mr. DENISON said is worthy of particular attention. He acknowledged, that the object of the measure was to supply the

public with a *better commodity at a cheaper rate*. Well; and did this gentleman vote against the Bill? He did; and now let us hear his reasons: that the beer dealers were a body of industrious individuals: that a large capital had been embarked in the beer trade on the faith of existing Acts of Parliament; and that this *faith* ought not to be violated. COLONEL DAVIES had said the same thing. This was very well answered by Mr. LOCKHART. He ridiculed the idea of vested interests, when the Board of Excise for *cause shown*, and where a Petty Sessions of Magistrates *without cause shown*, might, at any time strip a house of its licence! Curious faith of Parliament: curious vested interest. In short, this is, perhaps, the most miserable pretence that ever entered into the mind of man; and, yet, Mr. DENISON, a member of a county, makes use of it, in order to justify his opposition to a measure, by the adoption of which, as Mr. Robinson very well observed, the House would declare, that the interests of the poorer class of consumers should not be flung aside, because those interests happened to interfere with the profits of a great and long-established monopoly. That it is a monopoly, and a most extensive and oppressive mono-

poly, is clear, from the facts stated by Mr. FYCHE PALMER; and I must say, that the Ministers have no small degree of merit in setting at defiance the monopoly and its myrmidons, even with a certainty of losing a part of their own power if they chose to employ it corruptly. Members of *great cities*; *would-be-members* of counties; *actual members* of counties; these have not dared to set at defiance the barons of the bung and the knights of the spigot: all these have shrunk from a combat with those phials of wrath, those stink-pots of destruction; born in the budget of the brewer's druggist. The Ministers have set them all at defiance. They have stood up for the people against those who call themselves the people's friends.

I was never much more surprised, than when I saw you, Sir, opposing this Bill, which, it was denied by nobody, would make beer of the same quality cheaper than it was before. "The mere fact," as the Chancellor of the Exchequer observed, "that the price would be lowered, proved that the beer was now maintained at a higher price than was necessary." Nothing could be clearer or more satisfactory than this. Mr. MABERLY, who wanted

to set aside the Bill at once, said, that the "present Bill might, in some degree, *lower the price of beer.*" Mr. DENISON allowed this. Every one allowed this. All the opponents of the Bill must have allowed it; or else their objections were the most nonsensical that ever were heard of. You all of you complained, that the present brewers and the publicans would be injured. How injured? By *loss of custom.* Why should they lose their custom? Because those that buy their beer of them now would go and buy beer of the retail brewers. Why should they leave the present publicans and go to the retail brewers? Because, to be sure, they would get from the retail brewers *better beer for the same money, or, as good beer for less money.* You, indeed, said, "that the beer might be got *cheaper*, but as to its being *good*, that was quite out of the question. (A LAUGH)"

And I laughed too, Mr. Alderman. I do not always clearly see the House's reason for laughs; but, I could see a reason for the laugh here. If the retail brewer, Mr. Alderman, sold beer that was not good: if you really believed that he would not sell good beer; if you thought that the beer he would sell must be bad, and were, at the same time, persuaded that

the people would all run to him, and thereby "entail ruin on a large class of respectable publicans," what infernal stuff those publicans must now sell! What diabolical drugs they must be pouring out upon this thirsty community. I am not much of a lawyer, Mr. Alderman; but, if you are willing to swear before a Grand Jury what you are here reported to have said, I should not despair of getting from an honest Grand Jury true bills against the whole body of these "honest and respectable tradesmen."

Well, now, Sir, it is, I may venture to say, proved; it is confessed; it is taken for granted, that this Bill will give the labouring classes of this kingdom as good beer as they have now for less money than they now pay for it. Is not this a real unmixed good? Shall we, Sir, or, rather, will *you*, who have for a long time been looked upon as a stanch friend of the people, and who have been thought such by no man in the kingdom more decidedly than by myself: will you, Sir, who have always been opposed to the encroachments of the high and ancient aristocracy: will you now assist in endeavouring to prevent the Ministers from delivering the most oppressed and helpless part of the people from the exto

tions, the grindings of this grovelling aristocracy of the spigot and the bung?

And, upon what ground? That they have, forsooth, a vested interest in the monopoly; a vested interest in the right of selling beer to the poor for more than it is worth. On the ground that capital has been invested in the monopoly *on the faith of Acts of Parliament*. Oh! LOPEZ! much-injured MASSA MANASSAH LOPEZ! Oh! SWANN! much-injured Swann, why didst thou die? Come GATTON; come SARUM; come CORRUPTION thyself, in thy proper person, for here is Alderman Wood with justification complete for all and singular the abominations of which Reformers have ever complained, or which they have ever expressed a wish to remove. What! shall a daubed sign-post, stuck up but a month or two ago, give a vested interest, give a right of enjoyment, which are denied to parchment, having the seal of the Plantagenets? Curious that we should have lived to hear doctrines from yourself and our "patriot" county member, being a complete answer to all our arguments in favour of that Reform for which Englishmen have been struggling now for half a century!

There is yet one of your objections to notice, which objection

have perceived with peculiar regret; namely, that this Bill would *lessen the power of interference on the part of the magistrates*. Good God! And do I hear you, Sir, object to a measure, which your whole argument makes you confess to be otherwise for the people; do I hear you object to this measure because it tends to prevent the magistrates from interfering with the enjoyments of the people so much as they hitherto have done? Yes, painful as is the statement, I do hear you making this objection!

"Great evils," you said, "would arise from the establishment of houses for the sale of beer, over which the magistrates would have no control." You quoted COLQUHOUN, whom you call *an able magistrate*, and you praise his principle of placing public-houses *immediately under the eye of the magistrates*! Really one can hardly believe one's eyes and ears. This is the language of one of the creatures of PITT or PERCIVAL, or SIDMOUTH. One would think that you had been living in Lancashire of late. Butterworth was proceeding in the same strain; so that you are, at last, in good company, at any rate. But, this holy personage, happening to mention the injury that would arise to "public

morals" from suffering men to get a belly full of beer without suffering a magistrate to be looking on, the House, the reporter laments to say, was taken with such a fit of coughing, that not another word was to be heard in the gallery.

That "*public morals*" should receive more injury from men taking the beer home to drink it than drinking it at the public-house; that public morals should receive injury from a Bill that suffers men to take a parcel of beer into a workshop or into a private house to drink it, when they can do the same thing now, if they please; that public morals should be injured by a Bill, which must, of necessity, diminish the quantity of gossiping, sotting, gaming, and hawking; that public morals should be injured by such a Bill is a thought well worthy of those, who hold the doctrine of vested interests.

Here I stop, Sir. Having performed my duty, I say not a word in aggravation. I lament that I have had it to perform, and

I remain,

Your most humble

And most obedient Servant,

WM. COBBETT.

TO

PARSON BRERETON,

OF LITTLE MASSINGHAM, IN THE
COUNTY OF NORFOLK.

*On his Pamphlet, which contains,
like the book of Parson Malthus,
an attack upon the labourers,
who are paupers only because
they are oppressed with taxes.*

PARSON,

YOUR book, or pamphlet, is no more than a sort of *hash* of a part of the disgusting, bloody-and-raw and half-cooked mess of your brother Parson, MALTHUS. MR. COPELAND has given you a complete answer; and I should not have noticed your book, had it not afforded me a fair opportunity to give a blow to a *Parson*; to one of that tribe, from whom I have received so many blows, and whom the whole nation begins now to see in their true light.

Parson, your object is *to prevent parish relief being given*. ~~This~~ is your object. You and the rest of the parsons have been *pushed* a good deal by the *rating of your tithes*! This has set your *wits to work*; and those wits seldom travel out of the direct path of your interests. The taxes, necessary for the *purposes of the parsons*, have robbed, and do rob, the labourers

so much, that they must get from the parish, or *starve*. You *dare* not push them to the latter. You would not like *open rebellion*. Therefore, you hate the labourers. You cannot tell why; but you hate them. I will tell you why: *they cause deductions from the amount of your tithes*. That is the true and only cause of your hatred towards them. Your scheme would make them *half-naked*, like the Irish. You forget, that you must have them shut up in their houses from sunset to sunrise, and, besides this, have a bayonet and a red coat ready at every corner of a street! You are *puzzled*, Parson; but, you will be a great deal *more than puzzled* by-and-by. You smell danger; but, I am convinced, that you have not the scent so strong as you ought to have it.

Parson, why ought not *poor labourers* to be relieved? A very large sum has been voted, partly out of the taxes laid on the labourers, to relieve the *poor clergy*; and why should not something be given to the poor labourers? You talk of *idle* labourers. Are they more idle, Parson, than *non-resident* parsons are? You, Parson, have *two livings* yourself, I fancy; and, can you take care of the souls of the people in both these parishes?

But, Parson, I have not time now to deal with you in a proper

manner. I promise to do it shortly. I will take the side of the labourers; and if I do not place the parsons in a *proper light*, may I have to endure their blessings! I will show a little more plainly than you have, what it is that *makes paupers*: I will show, as clearly as day-light, that it is the church parsons, and the church parsons only, that have been the cause of the paupers.

EARL OF RODEN.

THE next Register will contain a Letter to the EARL OF RODEN, on his happy conversion, through the means of the *Bible Society*! What a fine thing is this Society! The noble peer was, it appears, *struck all at once*. Bless me! what a fine thing this Society must be! And all the servant girls subscribing their pennies towards this grand means of converting the wicked! I wonder whether these pennies came out of the wages of the pious souls, or out of what they purloin from their mistresses, when they are sent to market? They must think it a duty to deduct, when they conveniently can, from the means of a *sinner*; and, these pious damsels do, I dare say, think the greater part of mistresses to be sinners. A *caution to sinners*!—Never take a saint, *he*, or *she*, into your house.

HANTS PAPER, MAY 17.

AT the Meeting of the British and Foreign School Society, on Monday, Mr. F. Buxton told the following curious anecdote:—It had been his misfortune, when very young, to live with a gentleman, whose prejudices against the improvement of the poor were numerous and inveterate. There were, in that gentleman's opinion, three great causes of the demoralization of the poor—reading, writing, and arithmetic—(*laughter*)—and whenever a quarrel took place in his neighbourhood, he was in the habit of saying, "That is the effect of education." If a theft or a murder were committed, "There," he would say, "is another test of the bad effects of education." In speaking of his own steward, this hater of human improvement would say, "That man, to his credit be it spoken, is not able to read a word, or to write a figure; and yet he is, perhaps, the best accountant in the country." It was natural to inquire by what process of memory the steward kept his accounts. This was shown. A drawer was produced: in one compartment there was a parcel of beans, in another a parcel of peas, and in the remaining divisions there were various descriptions of grain. These were the symbols of various debts and payments, which with the aid of a strong memory, the steward kept with exactness, until one night a rat broke into his account-box, and down went the account of what was due from various tenants, and all was thrown into the wildest confusion and doubt (*loud laughter*). From that moment he (Mr. Buxton) had been a convert to the superiority of written or printed symbols.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 25th May.

IMPRESSMENT.

Mr. *Hume* said, he had a Petition to present from the Mariners, Watermen, and others of Greenock, against the practice of Impressment—a practice so irreconcilable with principles of justice and freedom, that it could not have been tolerated, he was persuaded, so long in England, but from the idea that it was absolutely necessary to the support of our maritime greatness. After a consideration of the subject, and consultations with many persons well qualified to give their opinion, he was persuaded that this supposed necessity did not exist; and peace was certainly the time to inquire whether the system could not be dispensed with. As regarded the relation of this with other countries, it was worthy of consideration whether it had not promoted the war with the United States, and whether, if we were again at war with every other country in Europe, it would be possible to put the system of impressment in force without being again involved with America. The petitioners stated, that if a Parliamentary inquiry took place, it would be found that the causes which seemed to make impressment necessary, were within the control of the Legislature. This he (Mr. H.) had no doubt would be fully established, but as he should soon have occasion to enter into the subject in detail, he should move that the Petition be brought up.—The Petition was read, and laid on the Table.

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending 22d May.

	<i>Per Quarter.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Wheat	63	0	
Rye	41	5	
Barley	33	6	
Oats	25	3	
Beans	37	7	
Peas	37	1	

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, 22d May.

	<i>Qrs.</i>	<i>£.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Wheat..	5,604 for 18,627	6	10	Average, 66	5	
Barley	1,979....	3,641	12	5.....	36	9
Oats..	13,313....	18,770	3	8.....	28	2
Rye.....	63.....	132	6	0.....	42	0
Beans..	1,261....	2,435	1	4.....	38	7
Peas....	513....	1,006	13	3.....	39	2

Friday, May 28.—The arrivals of all kinds of Grain this week are only moderate, but the weather being remarkably fine, has occasioned a great dulness to prevail in the disposal of all sorts of Grain. Prime Wheat obtains the same prices as Monday, but other qualities are nearly unsaleable. Barley is very dull at Monday's quotations. There is not much doing in either Beans or Peas. Oats find but few buyers at a decline of 1s. per qr. from Monday's terms.

Monday, May 31.—Only a moderate quantity of all descriptions

of Corn arrived last week, and this morning the fresh supplies of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Peas, are only moderate, and there are a few more vessels up with Oats from the northern ports. Prime samples of Wheat alone command last Monday's prices, but middling and inferior qualities are 2s. lower, and cannot be sold even at that reduction.

Barley is very heavy, and prices of last week are hardly supported. Beans sell freely on full as good terms as last quoted. Boiling Peas also sell well, and fully maintain their value. Grey Peas are unaltered. There was a good show of Oat samples this morning, and the prices have declined 1s. per qr. since last Monday, but to-day there has been an improved demand at the reduction, and a great quantity has been sold. The Flour trade continues in nearly a stagnant state, except for such as is fresh made.

Prices on board Ship as under.

Wheat, red, (old)	62s. to 72s.
— white, (old)	48s. — 78s.
— red, (new)	42s. — 48s.
— fine	50s. — 58s.
— superfine	62s. — 64s.
— white, (new)	48s. — 52s.
— fine	54s. — 62s.
— superfine	68s. — 70s.
Flour, per sack	55s. — 60s.
— Seconds	50s. — 55s.
— North Country	46s. — 50s.

ACCOUNT OF WHEAT, &c. ARRIVED IN THE PORT OF LONDON,

From May 24 to May 29, both inclusive.

Whence.	Wheat.	Barley.	Malt.	Oats.	Beans.	Flour.
Aberdeen	165
Aldbrough	303	58	12
Aldershot
Banff
Bridgewater
Berwick	890
Bridport
Boston	1580
Bridlington
Carmarthen	554
Dundee
Colchester	229	140	290	30	200	630
Harwich	498	18	752	13	239	469
Leigh	1117	10	40	35	215	164
Maldon	585	27	30	183	640
Eastbourne
Exeter
Gainsborough
Hull	1750
Inverness
Ipswich	260	174	676	10	390
Kent	1390	100	280	320	377	1314
Louth	360
Lynn	364	4	273	7
Penryn
Plymouth
Poole	20
Scarborough
Stockton
Southwold
Wells
Whitby
Wisbeach	2591
Woodbridge	43	115	96	79	153
Yarmouth	8	466	791	30	1150
Cork	145	245
Dundalk
Dungarvon
Waterford
Youghall	1285
Foreign	250	500	200 b
Total	5047	1253	2949	10121	1345	4917 200 b

Aggregate Quantity of other kinds of Pulse imported during the Week:

Rye, — ; Pease, 302 ; Tares, — ; Linseed, 440 ; Rapeseed, 10 ;

Brank, 15 ; Mustard, 12 ; Flax, — ; and Seeds, 81 quarters.

City, 2d June, 1824.

BACON.

Although the demand for consumption is very slack, yet the wholesale prices continue to advance. The prospect of fine weather gives hopes of a brisk demand, when the supply of Mackerel shall cease, and a plentiful supply of vegetables come in. Against this there is the certainty of many of the most considerable manufacturers going on making up for this market; a great quantity of Pork still on hand; and the opinion of some of the most experienced that the price is already high enough. On Board, 53s. to 55s. Landed, 56s. to 58s.

BUTTER.

Dutch 80s. to 86s. The stock of old Irish is on the shelf for the present.

CHEESE.

The warm weather is against this article, and some of the holders are alarmed; but are reluctant to give way in price.

Monday, May 31.—The arrivals from Ireland last week were 630 bales of Bacon, and from Foreign ports, 4186 casks of Butter.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, May 31.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	3	4	to	4 2
Mutton.....	3	6	—	4 2
Veal.....	4	6	—	5 6
Pork.....	4	0	—	5 0
Lamb	5	6	—	6 4

Beasts ... 2,277 | Sheep ... 18,830
Calves 190 | Pigs 230

NEWGATE (same day).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef.....	2	8	to	3 8
Mutton.....	3	0	—	4 0
Veal.....	3	4	—	5 4
Pork.....	2	8	—	4 8
Lamb.....	3	4	—	5 4

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef.....	2	6	to	3 8
Mutton.....	3	4	—	4 0
Veal.....	3	4	—	5 0
Pork.....	3	8	—	5 0
Lamb.....	4	8	—	6 0

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 10½d. by the full-priced Bakers.

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS—per Ton.

Ware	3	10	to	5	0
Middlings....	2	0	—	3	0
Chats	1	15	—	0	0
Common Red	0	0	—	0	0

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware	3	5	to	5	0
Middlings....	2	0	—	3	0
Chats.....	1	15	—	0	0
Common Red	0	0	—	0	0

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay ... 90s. to 120s.
 Straw ... 40s. to 50s.
 Clover 100s. to 126s.

St. James's.—Hay.....70s. to 120s.
 Straw... 39s. to 48s.
 Clover 105s. to 126s.

Whitechapel. Hay ... 90s. to 120s.
 Straw. 42s. to 50s.
 Clover.. 100 to 130s.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.			Barley.			Oats.			Beans.			Pease.		
	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.	s.	to	s. d.
Aylesbury	56	66	0	35	38	0	25	32	0	40	43	0	40	0	0
Banbury	60	66	0	36	38	0	23	26	0	40	44	0	0	0	0
Basingstoke	54	71	0	32	36	0	24	28	0	40	48	0	0	0	0
Bridport.....	56	72	0	24	28	0	18	22	0	40	0	0	0	0	0
Chelmsford.....	52	72	0	34	40	0	25	31	0	32	40	0	33	38	0
Derby	68	73	0	36	42	0	26	32	0	44	50	0	0	0	0
Devizes.....	56	72	0	32	38	0	26	32	0	42	48	0	0	0	0
Dorchester.....	52	74	0	24	32	0	23	27	0	39	48	0	0	0	0
Exeter.....	68	74	0	28	38	0	22	28	0	40	44	0	0	0	0
Guildford	52	74	0	34	40	0	24	31	0	40	48	0	40	43	0
Henley	52	76	0	35	39	0	24	30	0	38	44	0	36	45	0
Horncastle.....	60	68	0	28	34	0	20	28	0	40	50	0	0	0	0
Hungerford.....	47	69	0	26	34	0	18	31	0	36	44	0	0	0	0
Lewes	58	64	0	30	0	0	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lynn	52	66	0	28	32	0	21	26	0	38	39	0	0	0	0
Newbury	50	78	0	28	37	0	27	32	0	38	44	0	39	40	0
Newcastle	52	72	0	28	35	0	26	32	0	36	41	0	36	44	0
Northampton...	56	67	0	35	36	0	23	28	0	38	45	0	0	0	0
Nottingham	63	0	0	39	0	0	26	0	0	44	0	0	0	0	0
Reading	55	73	0	30	36	0	22	32	0	35	44	0	34	43	0
Stamford.....	54	68	0	34	37	0	21	28	0	38	44	0	0	0	0
Swansea	65	0	0	38	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Truro	65	0	0	37	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uxbridge	48	76	0	35	39	0	28	32	0	38	45	0	34	42	0
Warminster.....	44	66	0	24	37	0	26	30	0	40	50	0	0	0	0
Winchester.....	48	72	0	30	36	0	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yarmouth.....	58	65	0	28	32	0	24	28	0	36	39	0	38	46	0
Dalkeith*	28	35	6	25	32	0	21	26	0	20	24	0	20	24	0
Haddington*	20	36	0	23	30	0	19	25	6	20	24	6	20	24	6

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, May 25.—The demand for Grain and Flour has continued very slack throughout the past week, Oats only maintaining the late prices, whilst a small decline was experienced in most other articles of the trade. The market of this day was tolerably well attended, with a partial demand for Wheat, Barley, and Oats, which at its opening portended an improvement in value on these respective articles, but that not being realised, with the exception of Oats, which were about 1d. per bushel dearer, there is little or no variation in the prices from those of last Tuesday.

WHEAT, per 70lbs.				OATS, per 45lbs.				FLOUR, per 280lbs.									
s. d.		s. d.		s. d.		s. d.		s. d.		s. d.							
English	9	0	to 11	0	English	3	10	—	4	2	English	50	0	—	53	0	
Scotch	9	0	—	11	0	Scotch	3	10	—	4	2	Irish per					
Welsh	9	0	—	11	0	Welsh	3	10	—	4	2	280lbs.	46	0	—	49	0
Irish ..	8	3	—	10	3	Irish	3	4	—	3	11	OATMEAL, 240lbs.					
Foreign	0	0	—	0	0	BEANS, per qr.					English	33	0	—	35	0	
BARLEY, per 60lbs.				English	45	0	—	48	0	Scotch	32	0	—	34	0		
English	5	0	—	5	8	Scotch	42	0	—	44	0	Irish	29	0	—	31	0
Scotch	5	0	—	5	8	Irish	42	0	—	44	0	INDIAN CORN per					
Welsh	5	0	—	5		Dutch	42	0	—	44	0	quar.	48	0	—	50	0
Irish	4	10	—	5	4	PEASE, per qr.					RAPE SEED, per						
MALT.				Boiling	46	0	—	50	0	last £22.							
Per 9 gal.	8	0	—	9	0	Grey	38	0	—	44	0						

Imported into Liverpool from the 18th to the 24th May 1824, inclusive:—Wheat, 5,668; Barley, 429; Oats, 9,599; Malt, 2,018; Beans, 2,306; and Peas, 310 quarters. Flour, 1,934 sacks, of 280 lbs. Oatmeal, 103 packs, of 240 lbs. American Flour, 8,006 barrels.

Norwich, May 29.—A dulness pervaded the Corn Market to-day. Best Wheat with difficulty fetched 65s.; Barley, 26s. to 30s.; and Oats, 27s. to 30s. per qr.

Bristol, May 29.—The same dulness continues here in the Corn trade. The quotations named under, are nearly correct:—Best Wheat from 8s. 3d. to 8s. 6d.; inferior ditto, 5s. 6d. to 7s. 3d.; Barley, 2s. 9d. to 4s. 9d.; Oats, 2s. 6d. to 3s. 7½d.; Beans, 3s. 9d. to 5s. 9d.; and Malt, 5s. to 7s. 6d. per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 30s. to 50s. per bag.

Ipswich, May 29.—Our market to-day was fully supplied with Wheat, which met dull sale at a decline of 1s. to 2s. per quarter. But little business was done in any other Grain. Prices as follow:—Wheat, 54s. to 66s.; Barley, 30s. to 34s.; Beans, 36s. to 38s.; and Oats, 26s. to 28s. per quarter.

Boston, May 26.—This day's market was unusually crowded with samples of Wheat and Oats, but not so brisk as has been for some markets past, although at an advance for Wheat; prime samples at 2s. per quarter. Oats held up last week's prices, and obtained 1s. per quarter higher. Prices as follow:—Wheat, 62s. to 70s.; Beans, 40s. to 44s.; Oats, 23s. to 29s. per qr.

Wakefield, May 28.—Though the arrivals of Grain this week are only moderate, yet from the favourable change in the weather, the trade has remained extremely dull. The very finest samples of Wheat sell on full as good terms as last week, but the demand is almost entirely confined to this description. Very little doing in Barley; the sales made are much at the same prices as last noted. Oats and Shelling have not met that free sale as was expected, but both are rather dearer. In other articles no alteration.—Wheat, old and new, 60s. to 74s.; Barley,

24s. to 36s.; Beans, old and new, 38s. to 49s. per quarter 63 lbs. per bushel; Potatoo Oats, 28s. to 32s. per quarter; Mealing Oats, 15d. to 15½d. per stone of 14 lbs.; Shelling, 37s. to 38s. per load of 261 lbs.; Malt, 42s. to 44s. per load of 6 bushels; Flour, 50s. to 53s. per sack of 280 lbs.; and Rapeseed, 23l. to 26l. per last.

Malton, May 29.—Our market this week was but indifferently supplied with Grain. Prices as follow:—Wheat, 76s. to 80s. per quarter, five stone per bushel. Barley, 34s. to 36s. per quarter. Oats, 14½d. to 15d. per stone.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended May 22, 1824.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
London	65	2	36	9	27	5
Essex	65	1	35	7	26	10
Kent.....	63	2	36	6	26	5
Sussex.....	59	8	31	0	25	1
Suffolk.....	60	7	31	4	25	11
Cambridgeshire	58	7	32	4	22	8
Norfolk	62	4	30	9	24	5
Lincolnshire	64	3	35	2	23	1
Yorkshire	63	8	30	9	22	3
Durham	67	10	38	3	31	10
Northumberland	59	2	39	0	26	7
Cumberland	68	4	46	8	38	0
Westmoreland	73	3	48	0	35	9
Lancashire	68	2	27	1	29	3
Cheshire	67	4	45	3	28	9
Gloucestershire.....	64	7	34	0	27	5
Somersetshire	64	0	32	11	23	9
Monmouthshire	66	3	31	4	0	0
Devonshire.....	67	10	34	10	24	3
Cornwall.....	61	6	37	0	27	2
Dorsetshire	61	8	30	4	25	4
Hampshire	60	3	32	9	24	1
North Wales	74	0	46	6	28	1
South Wales	64	0	38	9	23	6

Total Quantity of Corn returned as Sold in the Maritime Districts, for the Week ended May 22.

Wheat. .34,527 qrs.	Barley..12,790 qrs.	Beans....3,138 qrs.
Rye..... 461 qrs.	Oats....24,715 qrs.	Peas.....437 qrs.

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Norwich Castle Meadow, May 29.—Our Cattle market was well supplied with fat and lean Beasts to-day; there was also a considerable number of Sheep, and several score Lambs penned. The best Lambs fetched 18s. per head; fat Beef, 7s. per stone of 14 lbs.; lean Beasts, 4s. 3d.; and fat Mutton, 6s. per stone. Considering the quantity of Cattle of all descriptions at market, very little business appeared to be doing, by far the greater part of the Sheep returning home unsold.

Herecastle, May 20.—Beef, 6s. to 6s. 6d. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 5d. to 6d.; Pork, 5d. to 6d.; Lamb, 6d. to 8d.; and Veal, 6d. to 7d. per lb.

Bristol, May 27.—Beef, 5d. to 6d.; Mutton, 6d. to 7d.; and Pork 4½d. to 5d. per lb. sinking offal.

Malton, May 29.—Meat in the shambles:—Beef, 5½d. to 6d.; Mutton, 4½d. to 5½d.; Lamb, 7d. to 8d.; and Veal, 6d. to 7d. per lb. Fresh Butter, 10d per lb.; Salt, ditto, 46s. per firkin. Bacon Sides, 6s. 6d. to 7s.; Hams, 7s. to 9s. per stone.

At **Morpeth Fair** on Wednesday, there was a great supply of Cattle Sheep, and Lambs; and being many buyers, fat met with ready sale, at last week's prices.—Beef, from 4s. 9d. to 5s. 6d.; Mutton, 4s. 8d. to 6s.; and Lamb, 7s. 9d. to 8s. 3d. per stone, sinking offals.

Boston, May 26—Our second Fortnight Market after the Fair for Cattle and Sheep, was largely attended for the time. The Sheep Market has wonderfully advanced in price since the Fair, being full from 6 to 8 shillings per head higher. Prime stock having sold from 45s. to 50s. per head. Meated Beasts were equal in proportion, and the Market in general cleared at an early hour.

Price of HOPS, per Cwt. in the BOROUGH.

Monday, May 31.—The Hop plantations make but slow progress, not having yet overcome the late severe check; a few flies have been seen in various districts, but the weakly state of the bines is not favourable for the fly, and it is yet early for them. Markets dull, but little doing.

Maidstone, May 27.—The change of weather this week has been particularly kindly to the Hop plantations: the bines have very much grown, and appear of a good healthy colour. We have not yet seen any fly in this neighbourhood, still the duty is called not to exceed 100,000.

Worcester, May 26.—On Saturday 118 pockets of Hops were weighed in our market. There is much inquiry after 1819's and 1822's, and the prices are looking up. The average prices may be

stated as follows:—1818's, 3l. 13s. to 4l. 4s.; 1819's, 3l. 12s. to 5l. and 5l. 12s.; 1822's, 7l. to 8l. and 9l. 9s. The accounts from the plantation state, that the plant has been affected by the frosts last week, but not materially injured.

COTTON MARKET.

Friday, May 28.—The Cotton market this week has been very firm, but the purchases reported are inconsiderable: the accounts from Liverpool, this morning, bring nearly a similar statement of that market.

OILS, per Ton, of 252 Gallons.

New Greenland Whale	£. 19 10
Pale Seal 24 0
Spermaceti 38 0
Linseed 25 0
Pale Rape 32 10
Galipoli, per 236 gallons 50 0